**GOVT 2305  
Ideology – What is Government for Anyway?   
Part 2 – Ideological movements after Burke and Paine**  
  
**About those Isms**

Since the debate between Burke and Paine the range of ideological viewpoints has flourished. You are likely to hear many ideological terms used in political debate – references to socialism and the like. Often these terms are used incorrectly, or at least without an appreciation for the internal conflicts each can contain. This subject can get pretty deep, so there’s no reason to wade into it too much, but it is important to have a general sense of what these terms are about and what history exists behind each. And of course I have some links that allow you to go further on your won if you choose to.  
  
Here’s a list of terms:

- Classical Liberalism  
- Capitalism  
- Socialism  
- Communism  
- Anarchism  
- Populism  
- Progressivism  
- Fascism  
 **Classical Liberalism**  
  
It might be best to begin our discussion of these terms by looking at two old terms from British politics from the 18th Century: Tory and Whig.

“[Tory](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tory)” refers to the political faction that supported the divine right of the monarchy. They were resistant to reform and supported the traditional authority of the state. Toryism was popular with the nobility and members of the King’s court.  
  
“[Whig](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Whig_(British_political_party))” refers to the faction that supported a strong Parliament – legislature – and a constitutional monarchy. They wished to reduce the hierarchical authority of the monarchy and put the monarch on par with the legislature. Whigism was popular with the emerging middle classes, especially the merchants who were becoming more part of the House of Commons.

Tories supported strong monarchic power. Whigs did not. They supported limits on the power of the monarch and government in general – at least to a point. The Whigs would become influential in development of the concept of [classical liberalism](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Classical_liberalism). Their name would also be adopted by [an American political party](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Whig_Party_(United_States)) in the 19th Century. [John Locke](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_Locke) and [Adam Smith](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Adam_Smith) – among many other British authors – also developed a variety of ideas that would culminate in an ideological viewpoint based on the primary importance of individual liberty.   
  
Classical Liberalism can be defined as “ a philosophy committed to the ideal of [limited government](http://www.wikipedia.org/wiki/Limited_government) and [liberty of individuals](http://www.wikipedia.org/wiki/Individual_liberty) including [freedom of religion](http://www.wikipedia.org/wiki/Freedom_of_religion), [speech](http://www.wikipedia.org/wiki/Freedom_of_speech), [press](http://www.wikipedia.org/wiki/Freedom_of_the_press), [assembly](http://www.wikipedia.org/wiki/Freedom_of_assembly), and [free markets](http://www.wikipedia.org/wiki/Free_markets).   
  
Note that “classical liberalism” sounds a lot like what we now call conservatism, or more properly libertarianism. We will discuss this shift further below, but in the early 20th century the [progressive movement](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Progressivism_in_the_United_States) began using the term liberalism to describe themselves, specifically they would call themselves [social liberals](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_liberalism). This has led to the obvious confusion about terminology. It places specific emphasis on private property rights and argued that the protection of property was a central function of a governing system. It is argued that the founders of the American Republic – though they had differences – are best referred to as classical liberals, or Lockean Liberals.  
  
Classical liberal focuses primarily on the individual. This made classical liberalism very different than the [collective ideologies](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Collectivism) that began to develop in Europe in the wake of the French Revolution. These point out a key difference between ideologies: Some are based on the individual, some are based on the collective.

This raises a question: Is society best thought of as being composed of fully independent people, or are we all interdependent?

And a related question: Can – or should – government be used as a vehicle for attaining certain goals?

The conservative tends to see it society as composed of individuals and that government should orient itself primarily to protect the rights of individuals. Primacy is placed on the private sector. The liberal tends to see society as a collected of interconnected individuals and that government should be actively used to improve the lives of those individuals. Those on the left argue that the common good is best attained by deliberately working for it rather assuming that it will inevitably follow from self-interested individual actions.   
  
Not surprisingly – considering that classical liberalism is focused on preserving property rights - the development of classical liberalism accompanies the development of capitalism.  
  
Some readings if you wish:  
  
- Princeton: [Classical Liberalism](http://www.princeton.edu/~achaney/tmve/wiki100k/docs/Classical_liberalism.html) [- You Tube: [What is classical liberalism](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iU-8Uz_nMaQ)?  
- The Rise, Decline, and Reemergence of Classical Liberalism](http://www.belmont.edu/lockesmith/liberalism_essay/index.html).   
- [Lockean Liberalism and the American Revolution](http://www.gilderlehrman.org/history-by-era/road-revolution/essays/lockean-liberalism-and-american-revolution).

**Capitalism**

Here is a definition of capitalism:   
  
*“ An economic system characterized by* [*private*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/private%5b1%5d) *or corporate ownership of* [*capital*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/capital) *goods, by investments that are determined by private decision, and by prices, production, and the distribution of goods that are determined mainly by competition in a* [*free market*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/free%20market) *.”*

Capitalism isn’t specifically an ideology, but it’s close. It claims that societies are best improved by allowing individuals the ability to make and implement decisions without immediate regard to the outcome. While capitalism as a system emerged slowly over time as commerce developed in Britain (and elsewhere, but let’s not complicate things too much) it did was not thought of as a unique economic system until [Adam Smith](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Adam_Smith) analyzed in [An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nation](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Wealth_of_Nations), published the same year as the Declaration of Independence as it turns out. His concept of the [invisible hand of the marketplace](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Invisible_hand) continues to influence supporters of capitalism. It provides one of the stronger justifications for a capitalist system.  
  
Here are a few choice quotes from Smith:   
  
*“Every individual...generally, indeed, neither intends to promote the public interest, nor knows how much he is promoting it. By preferring the support of domestic to that of foreign industry he intends only his own security; and by directing that industry in such a manner as its produce may be of the greatest value, he intends only his own gain, and he is in this, as in many other cases, led by an invisible hand to promote an end which was no part of his intention.”  
  
“It is not from the benevolence of the butcher, the brewer, or the baker that we expect our dinner, but from their regard to their own interest.”*

*“I have never known much good done by those who affected to trade for the public good.”*

Smith was suspicious that the public good could be improved by deliberate action. It was best achieved by the allowing individuals the ability to pursue their self-interest. He would have disagreed with Thomas Paine’s viewpoint of the objectives of government. He argued that the role of government is to facilitate the establishment and maintenance of the marketplace. This means providing a solid currency, security for the production and transportation of goods, infrastructure, and a court system for the resolution of commercial disputes. Little else apart from this is necessary. That sounds more like Edmund Burke than Thomas Paine. It also sounds like recent controversies between liberals – who argue that government programs that intend to directly solve social problems can be effective – and conservatives who are more restrained in thinking this is so.   
  
Another early student of capitalism was Karl Marx. He was also a strong critic of it, though he also understood its transformative nature. He also saw capitalism as an inevitable step that societies had to go through on their way to more perfect social, political and economic arrangement. He wrote these ideas out in [Das Kapital](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Das_Kapital), the first critical analysis of capitalism. Marx was largely responsible for developing the theories that became communism, thought the actual grunt work of making communism a reality was done by people who came of age well after Marx died.   
  
It’s often forgotten that Marx noted the role capitalism played in increasing productivity, wealth and innovation. In the [Communist Manifesto](http://www.anu.edu.au/polsci/marx/classics/manifesto.html) [Karl Marx](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Karl_Marx) commented on how capitalism unleashed the creativity of the “[bourgeoisie](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bourgeoisie).” Here’s a definition of the [bourgeois](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bourgeoisie): “of or characteristic of the [middle class](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Middle_class), typically with reference to its perceived materialistic values or conventional attitudes.”   
  
And here’s an extended quote from Marx regarding what capitalism allows the bourgeois to accomplish:

*“The bourgeoisie has disclosed how it came to pass that the brutal display of vigor in the Middle Ages, which reactionaries so much admire, found its fitting complement in the most slothful indolence. It has been the first to show what man's activity can bring about. It has accomplished wonders far surpassing Egyptian pyramids, Roman aqueducts, and Gothic cathedrals; it has conducted expeditions that put in the shade all former exoduses of nations and crusades . .*

*. . . The bourgeoisie cannot exist without constantly revolutionizing the instruments of production, and thereby the relations of production, and with them the whole relations of society. Conservation of the old modes of production in unaltered form, was, on the contrary, the first condition of existence for all earlier industrial classes. Constant revolutionizing of production, uninterrupted disturbance of all social conditions, everlasting uncertainty and agitation distinguish the bourgeois epoch from all earlier ones. . . .*

*. . . All fixed, fast frozen relations, with their train of ancient and venerable prejudices and opinions, are swept away, all new-formed ones become antiquated before they can ossify. All that is solid melts into air. All that is holy is profaned, and man is at last compelled to face with sober senses his real condition of life and his relations with his kind.” – Karl Marx*

His key point was that individual freedom, which forms the basis for capitalism, allows for innovation and growth. But it creates problems because the benefits of capitalism are unevenly distributed. Industrial development led to the creation of urban poverty, which was a largely new phenomenon. He saw increased competition between capital and labor and predicted increased political conflict between the owners of industry and those who work in industry as a result.  
  
Here are selected quotes from him:

*“In bourgeois society capital is independent and has individuality, while the living person is dependent and has no individuality.”*

*“Capital is reckless of the health or length of life of the laborer, unless under compulsion from society.”*

*“Capitalist production, therefore, develops technology, and the combining together of various processes into a social whole, only by sapping the original sources of all wealth - the soil and the labourer.”*   
  
Interestingly Even Adam Smith had cautionary things to say about the rise of capitalism.

*“No society can surely be flourishing and happy, of which the far greater part of the members are poor and miserable”  
  
“To feel much for others and little for ourselves; to restrain our selfishness and exercise our benevolent affections, constitute the perfection of human nature”*

Smith was concerned about growing inequality and did not agree with the idea that people should ignore the plight of others. The expansion of individual freedom did allow for tremendous growth and wealth creation. But at a cost: greater inequality in society. Concern for growing inequality led to the development of socialism and communism, both based on egalitarian principles rooted in the French Revolution. The costs imposed on the poor led to ideological opposition: socialism. This should help put the rise of socialism, and it’s more severe cousin communism, in context.   
  
**Socialism**

Let’s start with a definition:   
  
*socialism, social and economic doctrine that calls for public rather than private ownership or control of property and natural resources. According to the socialist view, individuals do not live or work in isolation but live in cooperation with one another. Furthermore, everything that people produce is in some sense a social product, and everyone who contributes to the production of a good is entitled to a share in it. Society as a whole, therefore, should own or at least control property for the benefit of all its members.*

[Socialism](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Socialism) is an ideology that takes a collectivist approach to society. It developed soon after the French Revolution and began to be popularized after the onset of the [Industrial Revolution](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Industrial_Revolution), which transformed society, but also great inequality and urban poverty. Socialism evolved as a response to capitalism. Early socialists promoted policies that would redistribute wealth and reorganize society. Sometimes, but not always, it would also include proposals to abolish private property and allow for governmental ownership of the means of production.  
  
Like many other ideologies, a great many groups claimed to be socialist and had disagreements with each other over goals and methods. The story of [socialism in the United States](http://www.spartacus.schoolnet.co.uk/USAsocialist.htm) is similar to that in Europe. It followed the rise of industry in the United States and the increased inequality that resulted from it. It developed in the United States later than in Europe because the United States was predominately agrarian for much of the 19th Century. Socialism was more of an urban than a rural movement. And it focused more on the needs of the working class, especially labor. Agrarian American was more equal that Industrial America so socialism did not gain much of a footing, and when it did, it was largely in the industrial areas of the north and northeast. These socialist movement were a response to what were seen as the excesses of [the Gilded Age](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gilded_Age). No surprise that the first major socialist party in the United States was the [Socialist Labor Party](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Socialist_Labor_Party_of_America).   
  
- [Click here](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_the_socialist_movement_in_the_United_States) for Wikipedia’s entry on socialism in the United States.  
  
As a side note involving Texas: One of the products of socialism in the US was the creation of a variety of utopian communities. One of the more famous was the [Oneida Community](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Oneida_Community). Texas had some as well, for example [La Reunion](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/La_Reunion_(Dallas)). [Utopian communities in the US](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_American_Utopian_communities) have their own [unique histories](http://www.history.com/news/history-lists/5-19th-century-utopian-communities-in-the-united-states) apart from the political story we are following here.

**Communism**

The most extreme form of socialism was [communism](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Communism), which was developed by [Karl Marx](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Karl_Marx) in the mid 19th Century.

Here are components of the definitions of communism:   
- a theory advocating elimination of private property   
- a system in which goods are owned in [common](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/common) and are available to all as needed   
- a doctrine based on revolutionary Marxian [socialism](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/socialism) and Marxism-Leninism that was the official ideology of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics   
- a totalitarian system of government in which a single [authoritarian](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/authoritarian) party controls state-owned means of production

Communism is apolitical and economic doctrine that aims to replace private property and a profit-based [economy](http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/692534/economy) with public ownership and communal control of at least the major means of production (e.g., mines, mills, and factories) and the natural resources of a [society](http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/551813/society). Communism is thus a form of [socialism](http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/551569/socialism)—a higher and more advanced form, according to its advocates. Exactly how communism differs from [socialism](http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/551569/socialism) has long been a matter of debate, but the distinction rests largely on the communists’ adherence to the revolutionary socialism of [Karl Marx](http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/367265/Karl-Marx).

Marx saw political conflict as primarily based on class conflict and developed a historical analysis that argued that the communist state – where workers owned the means of production – was the inevitable direction society was heading.   
Marx thought that communist governments were most likely to emerge in the advanced economies of the west – like England, France and the United States because having gone through a period of capitalism they had developed the “[means of production](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Means_of_production)” necessary to grow. It was a bit of a surprise that they would emerge in Russia and China that had not developed as capitalist economies.

**Anarchy**

While not especially vibrant currently, anarchism had its moment in the late 19th Century.   
  
Here are a few definitions:  
- the absence of government   
*-* a state of lawlessness or political disorder due to the absence of governmental authority   
- a [utopian](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/utopian%5b1%5d) society of individuals who enjoy complete freedom without government   
- absence or denial of any authority or established order   
*-* absence of order **:** [disorder](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/disorder) <not manicured plots but a wild *anarchy* of nature — Israel Shenker>

And another: anarchism is a cluster of doctrines and attitudes centered on the belief that [government](http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/240105/government) is both harmful and unnecessary. Anarchist thought developed in the West and spread throughout the world, principally in the early 20th century. [Anarchism](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anarchy) evolved in the late 19th Century, but instead of advocating for expansive government that can provide goods and services for the general population, anarchists advocated for the elimination of government.

[Advocates argued](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_anarchism) that societies of people are capable of organizing themselves “without a central coordinator imposing its own idea of order against the wills of individuals acting in their own interests.” Anarchism, at its simplest argues against the existence of publicly enforced government. The term can be confusing though because it is often used negatively to describe the violence that can sometimes emerge when there is no peace-keeping apparatus in society. Many advocates of reform were called anarchists by opponents who argued that their reforms – be they classical liberals or socialists – would lead to chaos.   
  
- [Click here](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anarchism_in_the_United_States) for a look at the history of anarchism in the United States.  
  
Later this semester – when we cover the development of the freedom of speech we will look at the case of [Abrams v US](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Abrams_v._United_States), which involved the speech rights of self-described anarchists.

**Populism**

Populism as a political concept can be a bit loose, but it has one underlying idea.  
  
Here are a couple definitions:   
  
- “A political philosophy supporting the rights and power of the people in their struggle against the privileged elite.”  
- “any of various, often antiestablishment or anti-intellectual political movements or philosophies that offer unorthodox solutions or policies”  
  
But the elite in question may be connected to the government or to the private sector, which can create confusion. The term populism is used to refer to almost any movement that emerges from the grassroots and reflects a general disenchantment with elites. Their precise policy positions can vary depending on circumstance. It’s always – at it’s a simplest – a struggle of the little guy against the big guy, but the character of populism can vary depending on whether a group is organizing against a government that is growing too large and is thought to be threatening individual liberty, or whether the group is concerned about the same threats coming from a large corporation or other private interest. These groups are not always the same.   
  
Populism can best be thought of as an ideological movement that began in the middle 19th century by distressed farmers who – among other things – were increasingly threatened by the power of railroads and bankers. Instead of becoming socialists, they became populists.   
  
Read this brief essay for more detail: [Agrarian Distress and the Rise of Populism](http://countrystudies.us/united-states/history-81.htm).

[Populism](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Populism) was especially powerful in the United States [from the end of the Civil War to World War II](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_the_United_States_(1865%E2%80%931918)). It began with the [Granger Movement](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_National_Grange_of_the_Order_of_Patrons_of_Husbandry), then the [Farmer’s Alliance](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Farmers%27_Alliance). The [People’s Party](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Populist_party) was formed in the early 1890s. [Positions taken](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ocala_Demands) by populists of that era – or at least the Farmers’ Alliance - included strong regulations of both railroads and banks, inflationary monetary policy (the use of silver as coinage), lowered tariffs, a progressive income tax, and the popular election of US Senators. One of the better known populist candidates was [William Jennings Bryan](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/William_Jennings_Bryan), who was the Democratic candidate for the presidency for several elections. Occasionally – depending on the mood of the public – candidates will emerge that are labelled populist.  
  
Here are recent examples

[George Wallace](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/George_Wallace) – who ran several times for president – represented the interests of the Southern Populists who were argued to be upset that liberal elites were forcing changes on racial relationships in the South.

[Ross Perot](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ross_Perot)’s candidacy in 1992 and 1996 was fueled in part by groups turned off by the existing parties and [increasingly distrustful](http://www.newrepublic.com/article/92369/ross-perot-united-we-stand-not-for-sale) of establishment politics.

Currently many argue that the Tea Party is at root [a populist movement](http://www.americanthinker.com/2010/02/populist_constitutionalism_and.html). Some claim it is [anti-populist](http://www.salon.com/2013/10/22/tea_party_is_an_anti_populist_elite_tool_and_it_has_progressives_fooled/) though.

The same [argument is/was made](http://articles.latimes.com/2011/oct/06/opinion/la-oe-ketcham-occupiers-20111006) about the Occupy Wall Street movement. Populism is probably less an ideology than political movement that flares up from time to time when the general population sours on the elites that run government and business in the nation. Populists can stand for anything that pits the little guys against the big guy. Populists are an ongoing feature of political in the United States. As we will see, it also a feature that the founding generation did not think was especially beneficial. Much of the design of the American constitutional system – as we will see soon enough is designed to restrict the ability of populists to have an immediate impact on the governing process.  
  
This might be worth a read: [Gore Vidal: The Virgil of American populism](http://www.salon.com/2012/08/02/gore_vidal_the_virgil_of_american_populism/)

**Progressivism**

As with populism, progressivism is tough to define as it is as much a political movement as an ideological one. A precise definition of progressivism is difficult to establish. [Here’s one person’s attempt](http://www.progressiveliving.org/politics/definition_of_progressivism.htm). But it is fair to say that what we now consider liberalism is much more like progressivism than classical liberalism. It sees government as a positive force in addressing and solving key social problems – especially those related to the poor. As with socialism, it rose in response to the rise of capitalism, but did not seek to own the means of production, but simply to increase regulations of it – among other things – in order to ensure that it benefitted the public good and did not allow for increased power of the business classes.  
  
Contemporary liberalism can be traced back to the [progressive movement](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Progressivism_in_the_United_States), which was especially active in the period from 1890 – the 1920s. The era has become known as the [Progressive Era](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Progressive_Era). While the era was argued to be over in the 1920s, the spirit of the movement continued through the [New Deal](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New_Deal) and the [Great Society](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Great_Society), and helped fuel the [Civil Rights Movement](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Civil_rights_movement). The movement was a response to the laissez faire policies common during the [Gilded Age](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gilded_age) as well as the hardships suffered during the [Great Depression of 1890s](http://eh.net/encyclopedia/article/whitten.panic.1893). The impulses behind it were similar to those behind both socialism and communism.   
  
It saw government as a necessary means to solve a variety of social problems, especially those that resulted from the increased inequalities brought on the by [industrial revolution](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Industrial_Revolution). The progressive movement had many goals, including eliminating corruption from government and improving governmental efficiency. It also sought to expand participation and strengthen the political power of the middle classes. A lot of contemporary conservative politics is oriented towards undoing what progressives established during this time.  
  
The current divide between liberals and conservatives can be traced to this dispute over the New Deal. As opposed to socialism and communism however, progressives didn’t push for nationalizing industry and other institutions, but rather to regulate them in order to minimize their ability to perpetuate inequities and to restrain the growing political power of corporations.

In the late 19th and early 20th centuries both the Republican and Democratic Parties had progressive wings. In 1912, ex-President [Teddy Roosevelt](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Theodore_Roosevelt) formed the [Progressive – or Bull Moose – Party](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Progressive_Party_(United_States,_1912)) and took with him many progressive Republicans. In the early 1930s, many progressives would join the Democratic Party as part of the [New Deal Coalition](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New_Deal_coalition).

Progressives were responsible for many of the regulations and regulatory agencies established during this time.   
  
Examples:

The Federal Reserve  
The Interstate Commerce Commission  
The Food and Drug Administration  
The Federal Trade Commission  
Security and Exchange Commission  
National Labor Relations Board

Each of these were designed to allow for the national government to alleviate some perceived problem created by unregulated [laissez-faire capitalism](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Laissez-faire). This would be replaced with [regulatory capitalism](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Regulatory_capitalism). This movement had a major impact on the development of politics and government in the early to mid 20th Century.

**Fascism**

Fascism can also be referred to as nationalism – the concepts are very similar. While neither [nationalism](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nationalism) or [fascism](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fascism) were major political forces in the United States, they did have major impacts on the U.S. due to their impact on the politics of Italy, Germany and Japan. One reason this is the case is that the latter three nations have a firmer, more clearly defined nationality. Being a nation of immigrants, it is more difficult for American to rally around a shared racial or ethnic identity.   
  
One often hears these terms used in contemporary debate, so they are worth knowing. See [Fascism and Ideology](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fascism_and_ideology).

Here is a definition of nationalism:   
  
- Loyalty and devotion to a [nation](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/nation); *especially* **:** a sense of [national](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/national) consciousness exalting one nation above all others nd placing primary emphasis on promotion of its culture and interests as opposed to those of other [nations](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/nations) or supranational groups.

And here are a couple definitions of fascism:   
  
1 - a political philosophy, movement, or regime (as that of the Fascisti) that exalts nation and often race above the individual and that stands for a centralized [autocratic](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/autocratic) government headed by a [dictatorial](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/dictatorial) leader, severe economic and social regimentation, and forcible suppression of opposition.  
  
2 - a tendency toward or actual exercise of strong autocratic or dictatorial control <early instances of army *fascism* and brutality

The term is often used to refer to political forces that see authoritarian control as preferable to a society that respects civil liberties. Both fascism and nationalism grew out of opposition to the growth of liberal democracy, the rise of individualism and a rationalist orientation to government. Fascism promoted a collectivist viewpoint of society where people are considered as parts of national and/or racial groups. Violence was a central component of fascism. It was celebrated and encouraged. And it helped with recruitment.

[Benito Mussolini](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Benito_Mussolini) is credited – blamed? – with the development of fascism in Italy between the 1920s and 1940s and the creation of the [National Fascist Party](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_Fascist_Party). [Adolph Hitler](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_Fascist_Party) was an early admirer and developed [a similar party](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nazi_Party) in Germany.